ľ							
$1 \mid$	DOUGLAS R. DAVIS KEESAL, YOUNG & LOGAN 1029 West Third Avenue, Suite 650 Anchorage, Alaska 99501-1954						
2							
3	Telephone: (907) 279-9696 Facsimile: (907) 279-4239						
4	Attorneys for Crowley Marine Services, Inc.						
5							
6							
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
8	DISTRICT OF ALASKA						
9	Gary Crochet,)					
10	Plaintiff,))					
11	vs.	,))					
12	Crowley Marine Services, Inc.,) Case No. 3:05-cv-00288-TMB					
13	Defendant.	SCHEDULING AND PLANNING					
14		CONFERENCE REPORT					
15							
16	1. Meeting. In accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(f), a meeting was						
17	held on February 22, 2006 and was attended by:						
18	Heather Gardner, attorney for plaintiff, Gary Crochet						
19	Douglas Davis, attorney for defendant, Crowley Marine Services, Inc.						
20	The parties recommend the following:						
21	2. <u>Pre-Discovery Disclosu</u>	<u>ires</u> . The information required by					
22	Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(1):						
23	□ has been exchanged	by the parties					
24	X will be exchanged b	y the parties by March 31, 2006					
25	Proposed changes to discl	osure requirements:					
26							

2

3

4

5

6

8

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

26

Preliminary Witness Lists

- □ have been exchanged by the parties
- X will be exchanged by the parties by March 31, 2006
- 3. <u>Contested Issues of Fact and Law</u>. Preliminarily, the parties expect the following issues of fact and/or law be presented to the court at trial in this matter:

PLAINTIFF:

- 1. Defendant's negligence was direct and proximately the cause of plaintiff's injury on 10/27/04 onboard the Barge 450-1.
- 2. Defendant failed to provide safe and seaworthy conditions aboard Barge 450-1. The unseaworthy condition was the direct and proximate cause of plaintiff's injury on 10/27/04.
- 3. Defendant is strictly liable to plaintiff for the injuries resulting from the unseaworthy condition(s) that existed aboard Barge 450-1 on 10/27/04.
- 4. Plaintiff suffered severe and permanent damage as a result of the 10/27/04 injury aboard Barge 450-1.
- 5. Defendant has failed to pay voyage continuation wages to which plaintiff continues to be entitled.
- 6. Defendant's refusal to pay continuance wages is wanton, outrageous, and retaliatory conduct.
- 7. Other issues may arise and be presented following completion of discovery. Plaintiff reserves the right to raise other issues.

DEFENDANT:

- 1. Was plaintiff injured as he alleges in his complaint?
- 2. Was defendant negligent as alleged by plaintiff in his complaint?
- 3. Was the negligence of defendant, if any, the proximate cause of

2

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

plaintiff's alleged injury?

- Was the vessel unseaworthy as alleged in plaintiff's complaint? 4.
- 5. Was any unseaworthy condition the proximate cause of plaintiff's injury, if any?
- 6. What are plaintiff's damages, if any, caused by alleged negligence or unseaworthiness as alleged in plaintiff's complaint?
- Were plaintiff's injuries caused or contributed to by his own fault, 7. intentional actions or negligence?
- Were plaintiff's alleged injuries caused by or contributed to by 8. actions or negligence of others over whom defendant had no duty or control?
 - 9. Has plaintiff failed to mitigate his damages, if any?
- 10. Were plaintiff's injuries, if any, the result of a superceding cause for which defendant is not liable?
 - Was plaintiff's discharge by defendant wrongful? 11.
- 12. Were defendant's actions in terminating plaintiff taken in good faith, with honesty of purpose, and not maliciously, and were defendant's actions job related and consistent with business necessity?
- 13. Whether plaintiff is barred from asserting claims or causes of action by virtue of the doctrines of unclean hands and in pari delicto.
- Whether plaintiff's claims relating to his 14. discharge preempted by federal labor law, and specifically §301 of the Labor Management and Relations Act (29 USC §185(a)).
- Are plaintiff's claims relating to his discharge barred by operation of the six month statute of limitation applicable to such claims?

1	:		
2	4. <u>Discovery Plan</u> . The parties jointly propose to the court the		
3	following discovery	y pla	n.
4	A .	Discovery will be needed on the following issues:	
5	Discovery will be needed on both liability and damages.		
6	В.	All discovery commenced in time to be completed by	
7	November 30, 2006_("discovery close date").		
8	C . 1	Limitations on Discovery	
9		1.	Interrogatories.
10			X No change from Fed.R.Civ.P. 33(a)
11			□ Maximum of by each part to any
12			other party.
13			Responses due in days.
14		2.	Requests for Admission.
15			X No change from Fed.R.Civ.P 36(a).
16			□ Maximum of requests.
17			Responses due in days.
18		3.	Depositions.
19			X No change from Fed.R.Civ.P. 36(a), (d).
20			□ Maximum of depositions by each party.
21			Depositions not to exceed one day of 7 hours unless
22	agreed to by all parties.		
23	D.	D. Reports from retained experts.	
24		X	Not later than 90 days before the close of discovery
25			subject to Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(2)(C).
26	ı		Reports due:
Ì			

1				From plaintiff
2				From defendant
3	!	E.	Sup	plementation of disclosures and discovery responses are
4	to be made	:		
5				Periodically at 60-day intervals from the entry of
6				scheduling and planning order
7			X	As new information is acquired, but not later than 60
8				days before the close of discovery.
9		F.	A fin	nal witness list, disclosing all lay and expert witnesses
10	whom a party may wish to call at trial, will be due:			
11				45 days prior to the close of discovery
12			X	Not later than September 29, 2006
13	5.	Pre	trial l	Motions.
14		X	No c	change from D.Ak. LR 16.1(c).
15		The	follow	ving changes to D.Ak. LR 16.1(c) [Check and complete
16	all that apply]			
17			Mot	ions to amend pleadings or add parties to be filed not
18	later than			·
19			Mot	ions under the discovery rules must be filed not later
20	than			_·
21			Mot	ions in limine and dispositive motions must be filed not
22	later than			·
23	6.	<u>Oth</u>	er Pr	ovisions.
24		A.	X	The parties do not request a conference with the
25	court before entry of the scheduling order.			
26				The parties request a scheduling conference with the
				_

1	court on the following issue(s):				
2					
3		В.	Alternative Dispute Resolution [D.Ak. LR 16.2]		
4			X This matter is not considered a candidate for court-		
5	annexed alternative dispute resolution.				
6			□ The parties will file a request for court-annexed		
7	alternative dispute resolution not later than				
8	:		☐ Mediation ☐ Early Neutral Evaluation		
9		C.	The parties \square do X do not consent to trial before a		
10	magistrate judge.				
11		D.	Compliance with the Disclosure Requirements of Fed. R.		
12	Civ. P. 7.1				
13			X All parties will comply within seven days		
14			□ Compliance is not required by any party		
15	7.	<u>Tria</u>	<u>l</u> .		
16		A.	The matter will be ready for trial:		
17			X 45 days after the discovery close date.		
18	<u> </u>		not later than		
19		B.	The matter is expected to take 8 days to try.		
20		C.	Jury Demanded: □ Yes X No		
21					
22	ļ				
23					
24	:				
25					
26					

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 25 day of February, 2006. 1 2 KEESAL, YOUNG & LOGAN 8 Attorneys for Crowley Marine Services, 4 Inc. 5 6 DOUGLAS R. CLAVIS **ALASKA BAR NO. 7605022** 7 8 LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL PATTERSON 9 Attorneys for Gary Crochet 10 11 By: 12 HEATHER GARDNER ALASKA BAR NO. 04 073 13 14 AA128582 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26